

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 31 July 2001 with twenty six claims, two of which were written in independent form. Claims 1, 6, and 13 were amended on 26 April 2004. Claim 13 has been amended herein for grammatical reasons and not for reasons of patentability or to narrow the claim. No claims have been allowed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,562,463 to Lipton ("Lipton"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "providing a display memory capable of holding two said image data frames comprised of odd and even image lines, a first said image data frame in a first half of said display memory and a second said image data frame in a second half of said display memory; storing a first said first-eye frame in said first half of said display memory; storing a first said second-eye frame in said first half of said display memory" Lipton does not show, teach, or suggest a memory capable of holding two image data frames, each comprised of a first-eye frame and a second-eye frame.

The Examiner stated, "Lipton discloses a method (method II in FIG. 11) for displaying a series of image data frames, each frame comprised of a first-eye (left eye, for instance) frame and a second-eye frame (right eye), wherein the method includes providing a display memory (A, B, C and D) capable of holding two image data frames comprised of odd and even image lines (A and C for holding odd lines, for example, and B and D for holding even lines; col. 16, ll. 16-33)." The applicant respectfully submits Lipton appears to teach storing image fields comprising only even or odd lines, according to FIG. 11, only three fields may be stored at a time.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lipton. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite, "a double-buffered memory electrically connected to said image processor for receiving and storing said processed image data said double-buffered memory capable of holding two image data frames, a first said image data frame in a first half of said display memory and a second said image data frame in a second half of said display memory, each of said two image data frames comprised of processed image data for odd and even lines of an image for a first eye and processed image data for odd and even lines of an


image for a second eye." Lipton does not show, teach, or suggest a double-buffered memory capable of holding two image data frames, a first said image data frame in a first half of said display memory and a second said image data frame in a second half of said display memory, each of said two image data frames comprised of processed image data for odd and even lines of an image for a first eye and processed image data for odd and even lines of an image for a second eye.

Claims 2, 4-7, 10-12, 14-15, 18, 19, and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being clearly anticipated by Lipton. Claims 3, 9, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0020809 A1 to Gibbon et al. ("Gibbon"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,508,750 to Hewlett et al. ("Hewlett"). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon in view of Hewlett in further view of Lipton. Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,701,154 to Dasso.

Claims 2-12 and 14-26 depend from Claims 1 and 13 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claims 1 and 13, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claims, much less the limitations of the independent claims in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated

SEP-07-2004 19:14

TI DLP(tm) BUS SVCS

214 567 7859

P.09/09

PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418

TI-29637 - Page 8